

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 23-25, 27-34, 38 and 39, are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 31, 32, and 38 have been amended as shown on pp. 5 and 6 of the Reply. Claims 30 and 34 have been canceled as shown on pp. 5 and 6 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection of Claims 30 and 34 Under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c)**

Claims 30 and 34 stand objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

In order to further prosecution, Applicants have canceled claims 30 and 34. Thus, this objection is moot.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-18, 23-25, and 27-34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 23-25, and 27-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller, *et al.* (US PGPub No. 2004/0049509) in view of Eager, *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,960,200).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claims 30 and 34 are canceled. Thus, the rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Claim 1, recites, “the configuration service component employing security *at per-setting granularity*.” The Examiner has admitted that Keller does not teach or suggest this aspect and instead relies on Eager to cure this deficiency. Office Action dated October 10, 2007, pg. 4.

However, Eager does not teach this aspect either. The Examiner cites col. 21, lines 37-40, which is copied below for ACL-based security at per-setting granularity:

At the data layer 140 level, security functions manage access control lists (ACL), which enable application administrators to set up a hierarchy of user types for controlling access to application resources.

Eager does not disclose ACL-based security *at per-setting granularity*. In fact, Eager does not appear to disclose settings at all. Instead, Eager merely states ACL-based security is used generally to control access to application resources without stating the level of granularity.

The Examiner posits that since an access control list (ACL) controls access to an associated object and a setting can be that object, Eager teaches *per setting granularity*. However, this logic is faulty since the associated object does not need to be an individual setting and can instead be a subtree of the registry, a configuration file, or a database table.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-8, 10-18, and 23-25, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over Keller, alone or in combination with Eager.

Applicants note that it is unclear what the Examiner believes in claim 27 is not taught by Keller and requires Eager to cure the deficiency. Hence, it appears that claim 27 is rejected as anticipated by Keller and Applicants are responding accordingly. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, appropriate clarification is requested.

Claim 27, recites, “***a local cache that at least temporarily stores changes to configuration information*** associated with an application, the configuration information ***comprising information other than dependency information.***” Keller does not teach this aspect.

The Examiner cites the Administrator GUI 285 as acting as the local cache. In particular, the Examiner posits that since it can be implemented using memory, changes to configuration information must inherently be temporarily stored. Although Examiner’s statement may be true of any modern computer system, such temporary storage in memory is not understood by one skilled in the art as a cache and such definition is inconsistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation *in light of the specification*.

Furthermore, even if the Administrator GUI 285 was a local cache under the broadest reasonable interpretation, it does not comprise information other than dependency information. Figures 2A and 2B of Keller illustrate a dependency management system of which the Administrator GUI is a subcomponent of. Even if

paragraphs 0117 and 0118 mention that dependency information can be derived from configuration files and other system repositories, it does not follow that non-dependency information is available in the Administrator GUI 285.

Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 27 is allowable over Keller.

As an initial comment, Applicants note that it is unclear what the Examiner believes in claims 28 and 29 are not taught by Keller and requires Eager to cure the deficiency. Hence, it appears that claims 28 and 29 are rejected as anticipated by Keller and Applicants are responding accordingly. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, appropriate clarification is requested.

Claim 28 recites, “storing at least some of the manifest configuration information in a configuration store.” Keller does not teach or suggest this aspect. The Examiner cites paragraph 0082 for showing this aspect. However, issuing periodic calls to determine whether changes in the dependency model have occurred does not teach this aspect. In particular, such periodic calls are associated with dependency information, not configuration information – which cannot include dependency information since the two are presented as different types of information in a previous aspect of claim 28. Furthermore, even if such calls were associated with configuration information, the passage does not teach or suggest storing the manifest information in a configuration store. For at least the same reason, dependent claim 29 is allowable over Keller.

As an initial comment, Applicants note that it is unclear what the Examiner believes in claim 31-33 are not taught by Keller and requires Eager to cure the deficiency. Hence, it appears that claims 31-33 are rejected as anticipated by Keller and Applicants are responding accordingly. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, appropriate clarification is requested.

Claim 31, as amended, recites, “providing a validation rule for the setting.” Keller does not appear to teach this aspect. The policy mentioned in paragraph 0100 of Keller is too general to teach or suggest a validation rule. For at least the same reason, dependent claims 32 and 33 are allowable over Keller.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

### III. Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller, et al. (US PGPub No. 2004/0049509) in view of Eager, et al. (US Patent No. 5,960,200) and further in view of Bondarenko, et al. (US PGPub No. 2004/0083479).

Claim 26 depends on claim 1. As discussed *supra*, Keller, alone or in combination with Eager, does not teach or suggest every aspect of claim 1. Bondarenko does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

### IV. Rejection of Claims 38 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Hellerstein, et al. (US PGPub No. 2002/0129356) in view of Keller, et al. (US PGPub No. 2004/0049509).

Claim 38, as amended, recites, “the legacy handler component *facilitates synchronization of the configuration store with a legacy store including a registry.*” The Examiner admits that Hellerstein does not teach or suggest this aspect and instead relies on Keller to teach this aspect. Office Action dated October 10, 2007, pg. 17.

However, Keller does not teach or suggest this aspect. The Examiner cites paragraph 0118 to teach this aspect, but this passage merely indicates that references to other systems can be present in the structural model if those references are contained in the system repositories, such as the registry. Contrary to Examiner’s assertions, it does not teach or suggest *facilitating any synchronization of a configuration store with a legacy store*. In particular, the cited passage does not teach or suggest writing any information to a legacy store, a necessary condition for synchronization.

Consequently, for at least this reason, Hellerstein, alone or in combination, with Keller does not render obvious every aspect of claim 38.

Claim 39 similarly recites, “means for synchronizing the means for storing configuration information with a legacy store including a registry.” The Examiner admits that Hellerstein does not teach or suggest this aspect and instead relies on Keller to teach this aspect in paragraph 0118. Office Action dated October 10, 2007, pg. 18. As discussed *supra*, Keller does not teach or suggest this aspect either.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731